

REMARKS

This submission with RCE is in response to the Final Action mailed January 3, 2007.

Amendments to the Specification

The Examiner objects to the Title as not being descriptive. The Examiner has presented a suggestion for a Title. The Applicant appreciates the suggestion, but finds that the suggested title does not accurately describe the claimed invention. The Applicants have, however, amended the Title in order to provide further description of the claimed invention.

Amendments to the Claims

Claims 1-26 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 2, 12, 23, and 25 have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, in paragraph [0050] of the application as originally filed. All amendments made herein are being made without prejudice.

35 USC 102

In the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-26 as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 7,213,266 to Maher et al. (hereafter "Maher"). The Office Action states in paragraph 16 that "Claims 1-25 are rejected", but this is taken to be a typo given the rejection reasoning given in paragraph 28 against claim 26.

There are three different recording mediums appearing in the claims, i.e. the first recording medium having protection information, like a compact disc (CD-reproduction unit 11); the second recording medium, like a hard drive 12a; and the contents server 3. The media data is recorded on the first recording medium. When one tries to copy the media data to the second recording medium, if there is a prohibition to copy the media data to the other recording medium because of copyright protection, the system is enabled to search the contents information corresponding to the media data inside the contents

server connected through a network and transferred through the service server 2 and to download the content data into the second recording medium *instead of* the media data downloaded from the first recording medium.

In Maher, there are disclosed user 108, content provider 101, credential, and network. Maher does not disclose all of the features of the claimed invention.

Maher is silent about the following features of the claim currently amended, namely “*an ID-information-sending device adapted to send ID-information corresponding to said media data to an information-providing apparatus via a network in a case where it is recognized that said first recording medium has the protection information related to said media data;*” and “*said system is adapted to record at least a portion of said contents information received instead of recording said media data onto said second recording medium upon receipt of said corresponding content information related to said media data*”.

The Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection against the claims be withdrawn.

* * * * *

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees that may be required or to credit overpayment to deposit account no. 12-0415. In particular, if this RCE is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 (a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 12-0415.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically transferred to the USPTO via EFS on

January 15, 2009
(Date of Transmission)

Joanna Sosa
(Name of Person Transmitting)

/Joanna Sosa/
Signature

January 15, 2009
Date

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian J. Cash 60,546/
Brian J. Cash
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 60,546
LADAS & PARRY
5670 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 2100
Los Angeles, CA 90036
(323) 934-2300 voice
(323) 934-0202 fax
bcash@la.ladas.com